

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

JAMES TAYLOR,)	3:12-CV-0334-MMD (VPC)
)	
Plaintiff,)	<u>MINUTES OF THE COURT</u>
)	
vs.)	March 15, 2013
)	
PAUL LESSARD, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE VALERIE P. COOKE, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: LISA MANN REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT(S): NONE APPEARING

MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:

Defendants' motion for leave to file corrected limited opposition to plaintiff's motion to increase copywork limit (#14) is **GRANTED**. Defendants corrected opposition is on file as docket #15.

Also before this court is plaintiff's motion to extend copywork limit (#10). Defendants filed a corrected and limited opposition to plaintiff's motion (#15). The court notes that plaintiff moved to extend his copywork limit before the District of Nevada instituted its new electronic filing program at the Northern Nevada Correctional Center on March 5, 2013. Plaintiff's need for copies will now be substantially reduced or eliminated with the new electronic filing program because plaintiff will be retaining his original documents submitted for filing, and a copy will be electronically submitted to opposing counsel and the court. *See Nevada Department of Corrections AR 723.*

Plaintiff discovery in inmate lawsuits most often consists of written interrogatories, requests for document production to defendants, and requests for admission. These are written questions sent from one side to the other in a lawsuit, attempting to get written answers to factual questions or seeking an explanation of the other side's legal contentions. Thus, written discovery generally does not require that exhibits be attached by an inmate. Discovery is not filed with the court. Therefore, plaintiff only needs to produce one original document in response to the discovery requests to be mailed to counsel for the defendants. Should plaintiff desire to keep a copy for himself, he can recreate his own copy or make use of carbon paper. Therefore,

Plaintiff has failed to show good cause for an increase in his copywork limit and his motion (#10) is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

LANCE S. WILSON, CLERK

By: /s/
Deputy Clerk